U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/667,600 Response filed November 24, 2004 Reply to OA dated August 25, 2004

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 6, and replaces the original sheet for FIG. 6. In FIG. 6, the labels  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  and corresponding arrows have been added.

\* \* \* \*

**REMARKS**:

Claims 1-13 are currently being considered, of which claims 1, 4, and 5 have been amended.

No new claims have been added. Applicant respectfully believes that no new matter has been

introduced.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because of informalities. In particular, the

Examiner has suggested that some language in the disclosure is not in proper idiomatic English. The

specification and abstract have been amended to remove informalities. Thus, Applicant respectfully

submits that this objection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to claims 3 and 9, and has stated: "it is unclear what type of

pyramid a 'regular' pyramid is. Appropriate correction is required to clarify the form of the

pyramid."

Applicant respectfully traverses this objection to claims 3 and 9.

The phrase "regular pyramid" is clear and is commonly understood. It is well known that a

pyramid is a polygon with all the vertices joined to a point outside the plane of the polygon. It is also

well known that a regular pyramid is a pyramid that has a base that is a regular polygon, and has

lateral faces that are all congruent isosceles triangles.

-11-

For example, the World Book Online Reference Center (http://www.worldbookonline.com/)

states: "In a regular pyramid, the faces are all congruent (equal in size and shape). Such a pyramid

has a base that is a regular polygon—that is, a polygon with all sides equal and all angles equal. A

perpendicular line extended from the vertex of a regular pyramid meets the base at its center."

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to claims 3 and 9 should be

withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to claims 1-13 because of various noted informalities. In

particular, the Examiner has suggested that claims are not in proper idiomatic English. Claims 1,

4, and 5 have been amended to remove the noted informalities. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits

that the objection to claims 1-13 should be withdrawn.

Reference symbols A<sub>1</sub> and A<sub>2</sub> are discussed in the specification (p.6, lines 14-16). FIG. 6 has

been amended to show reference numerals  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ .

Before turning to the cited art, a brief review of the present invention is in order. The present

invention relates to a hair iron device, comprising: a hair iron main body to hold hair with a first iron

and a second iron oscillatable to open and close to set the hair, and plural small protruding portions

disposed on corresponding faces of the first and second irons which mutually come close to each

-12-

other and engage each other in a closed state of the first iron and the second iron to hold the hair.

The present invention discloses the following features, inter alia: (1) protruding portions 11a,11b

on the faces of the first and second irons 1,2 are arranged in a plurality of rows surrounding and

spaced apart from central portions (see Fig. 4) of the faces of the first and second irons 1,2; (2) a

central portion of first iron 1 forms steam jetting holes 13 having cross-sectional area A<sub>1</sub>; and (3) a

central portion of second iron 2 forms steam suction holes 14 having a cross-sectional area A<sub>2</sub> which

is larger than  $A_1$ .

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by USP 5,584,307 (Bauer).

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over USP 1,798,760 (Rothman)

in view of USP 4,163,143 (**Federico**).

Claims 4, 6, 7, and 10-12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Rothman in

view of Bauer.

Claims 5, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Rothman in view

of Bauer and Federico.

-13-

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Rothman in view of Bauer

and USP 6,119,702 (Habibi).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1-13.

Baur, Rothman, Federico, and Habibi, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or

suggest the following features set forth in claim 1, as amended: "the small protruding portions on

the face of the first iron are arranged in a plurality of rows surrounding and spaced apart from a first

central portion of the face of the first iron, the first central portion forming a plurality of steam jetting

holes having a first cross-sectional area, and the small protruding portions on the face of the second

iron are arranged in a plurality of rows surrounding and spaced apart from a second central portion

of the face of the second iron, the second central portion forming a plurality of steam suction holes

having a second cross-sectional area, the first cross-sectional area being smaller than the second

cross-sectional area", in combination with the other claimed features.

Baur, Rothman, Federico, and Habibi, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or

suggest the following features set forth in claim 4, as amended: "the protruding portions on the face

of the first iron are arranged in a plurality of rows surrounding and spaced apart from a first central

portion of the face of the first iron, the first central portion forming a plurality of steam jetting holes

having a first cross-sectional area, and the protruding portions on the face of the second iron are

-14-

arranged in a plurality of rows surrounding and spaced apart from a second central portion of the face

of the second iron, the second central portion forming a plurality of steam suction holes having a

second cross-sectional area, the first cross-sectional area being smaller than the second cross-

sectional area", in combination with the other claimed features.

Baur, Rothman, Federico, and Habibi, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or

suggest the following features set forth in claim 5, as amended: "the small protruding portions on

the face of the first iron are arranged in a plurality of rows surrounding and spaced apart from a first

central portion of the face of the first iron, the first central portion forming the steam-jetting holes

having a first cross-sectional area, and the small protruding portions on the face of the second iron

are arranged in a plurality of rows surrounding and spaced apart from a second central portion of the

face of the second iron, the second central portion forming the steam suction holes having a second

cross-sectional area, the first cross-sectional area being smaller than the second cross-sectional area",

in combination with the other claimed features.

Claim 2, 3, and 6-13 depend directly or indirectly from one or more of claims 1, 4, and 5.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-13 should be withdrawn.

-15-

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/667,600 Response filed November 24, 2004 Reply to OA dated August 25, 2004

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

Darren R. Crew
Attorney for Applicant

23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Reg. No. 37,806

DRC/llf Atty. Docket No. **031177** Suite 1000 1725 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 659-2930

Enclosures: Replacement Sheet of Drawing (Fig. 6)

Substitute Abstract of the Disclosure